

NOV 8 1923

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.

Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVII, No. 5

MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1923

WHOLE No. 455

Motion Pictures for the School

From the
George Kleine Cycle of Film Classics

JULIUS CAESAR

A Photo-Masterpiece in Six Reels

Posed and Executed in and about Rome, Italy. Period 80 B.C. to 44 B.C.

THE LAST DAYS OF POMPEII

Six Reels

SPARTACUS

Six Reels

Endorsed by Leaders in the Movement of Visual Instruction

These films can be rented at reasonable rates by institutions and other exhibitors in New York State and New England from our New York office; in the State of Illinois from our Chicago office. Other territories are covered by State Universities and the films can be rented direct from them.

For complete information in regard to the Exchange which will supply you, rental prices, booking dates, etc.,
Address

GEORGE KLEINE

729 Seventh Avenue
New York City

116 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Ill.

The Place Latin Books

"At last we have a first-year book, in **Place's Beginning Latin**, which contains not only the necessary material accurately and clearly stated, but lots of interesting Latin, too, with directions for study so explicit that, in many cases, the pupil can become his own teacher. Pupils enjoy the book. Young teachers find in it a wealth of practical hints and devices which they would ordinarily accumulate only after years of teaching".

RACHEL L. SARGENT,
University of Illinois High School,
Urbana, Illinois

"The paper, print, pictures, and general make-up of **Place's Second Year Latin** are excellent. The introductory lessons do indeed "bridge the gap", while the carefully outlined lessons serve their purpose well and save much time in assignment. The introduction and other explanations in English are the best I have seen, especially in the interesting connection and parallels with the late Great War".

ELIZA K. BROWN
West High School,
Minneapolis, Minnesota

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

Ginn and Company

D'OOGHE AND EASTMAN CAESAR IN GAUL

A Life of Caesar, in English, an account of the condition of Gaul, Britain and Germany at the time of the Gallic Wars, and a discussion of the methods of Roman warfare give the student of D'Ooghe and Eastman a proper political background. Ritchie's "The Argonauts", Nepos's "Hannibal", and a simple biography of Caesar in Latin put his first year Latin in good working form. Thus equipped could he fail *vincere omnem Galliam*?

70 Fifth Avenue

New York City

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVII, No. 5

MONDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1923

WHOLE No. 455

THE ETRUSCAN PROBLEM

(Concluded from page 28)

There is another scrap of ancient evidence which some scholars have interpreted as conflicting with the Greek traditions. After speaking of the Etruscan settlements along the Adriatic and between the Po and the Alps, Livy says (5. 33.11):

. . . Alpinis quoque ea gentibus haud dubie origo est, maxime Raetiis; quos loca ipsa efferarunt, ne quid ex antiquo praeter sonum linguae, nec eum incorruptum, retinerent.

Livy of Patavium had abundant opportunity to learn of the peoples and the languages about the head of the Adriatic; some of his neighbors probably knew the Rhaetian language, and quite possibly he had heard it himself, and knew at first hand of its resemblance to Etruscan. But it does not follow, as some have thought, that the Rhaetians were Etruscans left behind when that people crossed the Alps in a migration overland from the Aegean region. The only other basis for such a theory is the assumption that a journey by sea from the Aegean to the Tuscan shore is unlikely at so early a date; but we have seen that, according to Egyptian records, the Aegean Tyrrheni were seafarers as early as the thirteenth or the fourteenth century B. C. Of course we are not to think of an ambitious expedition such as Herodotus assumes, but of numerous small raiding parties which frequently left some of their members behind—much as the Northmen overran Northumbria some 2,000 years later. Such an invasion is more probable than an overland migration by a seafaring race. Probably the Rhaetian language also was brought from the Aegean region by sea at an early date.

We must, however, reckon with the possibility that the Tyrrheni landed on the Adriatic side of the peninsula, as Hellanicus says they did. The fact that the important Etruscan cities lie inland would find its explanation, if this were the case. It is possible, then, that the ancestors of the Rhaetians reached Italy in company with the ancestors of the Etruscans.

A connection between Etruscan civilization and the East is indicated by numerous resemblances in customs and in art. Etruscan divination is in part to be traced to the same origin as Babylonian. The Umbrian Plautus, who doubtless had considerable knowledge, as well as lusty prejudices, about the Etruscans, makes a slave say to a girl who had been kidnapped and reared by a meretrix (Cist. 562-563):

. . . non enim hic, ubi ex Tusco modo tute tibi indigne dotem quaeras corpore.

Surely no other Italian people harbored the oriental

custom of putting their daughters out to such an apprenticeship.

There are also many features that point to the Aegean lands and Asia Minor specifically. A mass of archaeological evidence was noted by Oscar Montelius, in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* 26. 254-261 (with sixteen plates). Of the archaeological parallels that have since been pointed out we may mention especially burial mounds with interior chambers resembling those of Lydia. The Roman *atrium* was of Etruscan origin, and its identity with the Homeric and Mycenaean μέγαρον is obvious. The Etruscan helmet which served as a model for the head-dress of the Salii was similar to Mycenaean helmets. The prominence of Greek mythology in Etruscan art is familiar. While such evidence is in itself proof merely of intercourse, it has very great cumulative value as supporting more definite indications of an actual migration.

For a long time the chief linguistic argument for a connection between Etruria and the Aegean region was furnished by the pre-Hellenic inscription discovered in Lemnos in 1885. The similarity of its language to Etruscan has often been affirmed and almost as often denied. The arguments adduced by Franz Skutsch (Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 6.783) and by Sophus Bugge (Das Verhältniss der Etrusken zu den Indogermanen und der Vorgriechischen Bevölkerung Cleinasiens und Griechenlands, 6-7) have now made the relationship of Lemnian to Etruscan pretty clear, while it is even more clear that the two languages are not identical. Skutsch lays particular stress upon the Lemnian phrase *sialxveiz aviz* (also *aviz sialxvis*). Since the inscription seems to be an epitaph, or rather two epitaphs, a record of the age of the deceased is to be expected. The word *aviz* resembles Etruscan *avils*, 'years', and *sialxveiz* reminds one of the Etruscan suffix *-alx-*, which forms tens from units (e. g. *cealxl*, 'fifty', from *ci*, 'five'). The Etruscan word for 'six' is *sa*, and the word for 'sixty', which is not quotable, was probably *salx-*, *sealx-*, or the like. The Lemnian, whose epitaph we have, seems, then, to have died at the age of sixty. Bugge lists seventeen details in which Lemnian and Etruscan are alike; e. g. both contain an enclitic *-m*, and both have many suffixes containing *l* (compare Lemnian *phokiasiale* with Etruscan *larθiale*).

The recent excavations at Sardis have brought to light a number of Lydian inscriptions, and some progress in their interpretation has already been made. Dr. Enno Littmann, who is publishing them, in *Publications of the American Society for the Excavation of Sardis*, 6. 1. 80-82, lists a number of resemblances to the

Etruscan inscriptions, but most of these are either doubtful or unimportant. One of the most striking is the fact that the symbol 8 stands for the sound *f* in the Lydian alphabet as well as in the Etruscan. This has no bearing upon the relationship of the two languages, since alphabetic signs have often been transferred from one language to another without regard to their relationship. The question is how the character was carried from East to West; that is, the symbol 8 belongs, as far as our problem goes, in the same category with the archaeological evidence mentioned above. It is interesting to note that the sound *f* is denoted in the Lemnian inscription by a form of koppa and in Southern Etruria sometimes by the same form of koppa followed by H.

Other students are inclined to agree with Dionysius of Halicarnassus (see page 27) in finding the resemblances between Lydian and Etruscan less striking than certain other resemblances. O. A. Danielsson, *Zu den Lydischen Inschriften* (according to R. Thurneysen, *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* 50. 38), says that the new inscriptions resemble Etruscan less than they do the early Lemnian inscription. Thurneysen (*ibidem*) thinks Lydian more like Indo-European than like Etruscan.

It seems likely that Lydian and Etruscan were related languages, but that both resembled the languages of the Aegean region more closely than they did each other. A fuller understanding of the Lydian inscriptions may assist in the interpretation of Etruscan, and Etruscan may here and there furnish a useful hint to the students of Lydian, but wide differences between the two languages are already apparent.

It is now generally recognized that most of the languages of Asia Minor and the pre-Hellenic languages of Greece proper and the islands were akin; numerous place names throughout these regions bear witness to the old linguistic unity. Furthermore, many of the Greek mythological names were borrowed from the primitive Aegean languages, and other parts of the Greek vocabulary contain many loans from the same source⁹. If, therefore, the Etruscans are an offshoot of a primitive Aegean people, we should find Aegean names and Greek words borrowed from Aegean languages recurring in recognizable form in Etruscan, and, since Latin is full of names and other words of Etruscan origin, correspondences between that language and Aegean material are significant. As the migration to Italy seems to have occurred in comparatively recent times, we may also expect to find in Etruscan occasional Greek names and words borrowed from their Hellenic neighbors by the Tyrrhenians before they left the Aegean lands.

Certain correspondences of this sort were observed many years ago, but the material has only recently been subjected to really scientific treatment¹⁰. Although a mere beginning has been made, the evidence adduced seems to establish the connection of Etruscan

with the Aegean languages. The comparisons, of which the following are illustrations, show a good deal of irregularity in sound. Certain phonetic laws can be made out, but there remains more variety in sound substitution than comparative grammarians usually assume. The explanation is that we are here dealing with loan-words or with proper names transcribed in a foreign alphabet.

In the way of personal and place names the material is extremely abundant, and it is the great number of the resemblances that is chiefly significant. While it is rarely possible to prove that any particular Italian name is related to a similar name found in Asia Minor or in Greece, so many correspondences can scarcely be due to chance. Nevertheless we have space for only a few illustrations.

Sues.a, the name of two Latin towns, reappears in *Συεσσα*¹¹, a place in Lycia, and in the name of a Phrygian village, *Συασσος*. We find the Roman *Subura* in the Cappadocian city-name *Σοβαρα*. Among the personal names common to both regions are Cilician *Ουαρος*, beside *Varus*; Lycian *Μuskka*, Phrygian *Μοσχας* (whence Greek *Μόσχος*, etc.), beside *Musca*; Lycaonian *Καλπος*, beside *Calpius*; Pisidian *Κασσις*, Phrygian *Κασιος*, and Pisidian, Cilician, and Lycian *Κασιας*, beside *Cassius*; Lesbian *Λαριχος*, beside Etruscan *Larice*. *Λαρισα*, the name of towns in Lydia, the Troad, and Thessaly, reminds us of Latin *Larisius*. *Τουβερις*, a Lycian heroine, and *Τυβερισσος*, a Lycian city, resemble Etruscan *Θυπρε* and Latin *Tubero*; the suggested connection of these with the river name *Tiberis* is more doubtful. The Lycian hero *Ρωμος* is to be connected with the Etruscan name *Rumi*, and perhaps also with *Roma*. An interesting group of names consists of *Αρνη*, the name of several towns in Greece, and of several mythological characters, *Αρνα*, name of a Lycian city, *Αρνηα*, a Lycian personal name, *Arna*, a town in Umbria, the river name *Arnus*, the Etruscan personal names *Arnal* and *Arinei*, and Latin *Arennius*.

Of more importance are the names showing identical suffixes. From the base appearing in Pisidian *Κοττης*, Lydian *Κοττας*, Lycaonian *Κουτι*, and Latin *Cotta*, we have, with an *n*-suffix, Pamphylian place names *Κοτανα* and *Κοτεννα*, a Pisidian and Lycaonian personal name *Κοτ(τ)ονης*, and Etruscan *Cutana*. With an *l*-suffix we have Carian *Κοτυλων*, Etruscan *Cullisal*, and Latin *Cutluloniakus*, and, with an *r*-suffix, Pamphylian *Κυδρης* and Latin *Codrus*. An *s*-suffix appears in Lycian *Κοτασις* and Latin *Cottasianus*.

The base of Lycian and Isaurian *Μαρις*, Carian *Μαρενς*, Lycaonian *Μαρις*, Etruscan *Marie*, and Latin *Mar(r)ius* appears with a suffix *-on* in Cilician and Pisidian *Μαρων* and Latin *Maro*, *Maronius*, etc. The same suffix forms Lydian *Τυλων* and Latin *Tullonius* from *Τυλ(λ)ος*, the name of a Lydian hero, Etruscan *Tule*, and Latin *Tullus*.

From *Μυρα*, name of a Lycian city, Lydian and Phrygian *Μυρης*, and Latin *Murra* an *n*-suffix produces Lycian *Μυρνηα* (*Μοπρα*), Etruscan *Murina*, and Latin

⁹See Emile Boissacq, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque*, VIII, and references.

¹⁰See especially G. Herbig, *Kleinasiatisch-Etruskische Namensgleichungen*; M. Hammerström, *Griechisch-Etruskische Wortgleichungen*, in *Glotta* 11. 211-217; Paul Kretschmer, *Glotta* 11. 277.

¹¹There is very little evidence as to the breathings and the accents which the Greeks employed in pronouncing these foreign names. It is not worth while to supply any by conjecture.

Murena. The *n*-suffix appears also in a Lydian epithet of Zeus, *Ταρνυνηος*, and in Latin *Tarquenna* and *Tarquinius*. There is an additional *t*-suffix in Lycian *Trqqñti*, Etruscan *Tarχntias*, and Latin *Tarcontius*.

Among the suffixes thus shown to belong to the languages of Asia Minor and the Aegean region and also to Etruscan are *-a*, *-na*, *-i*, *-u*, *-l*, *-r*, *-s*, *-t*, and various combinations of these. Several of them had previously been recognized by those who were studying the Aegean and Anatolian languages and Etruscan separately.

A striking feature common to the languages of Asia Minor and Etruscan is the use of names of relationship as personal names. Examples are *Απ(π)ας*, *Αβ(β)ας*, Etruscan *Apa*; *Παπ(π)ας*, Etruscan *Papa*, *Μαμα(ς)*, Etruscan *Mama*; *Ναννη*, Latin *Nanneius*; *Νεννος*, Etruscan *Nene*. In addition the Etruscans used as personal names their words *clan*, 'son', *sec*, 'daughter', *ali*, 'mother', and *puia*, 'wife'.

Another field where Etruscan shows many points of contact with the Aegean region is that of the mythological names. It has generally been supposed that these names, as well as the myths themselves, came to Etruria in later times along with Greek art objects treating mythological subjects. It is unlikely, however, that foreign folklore, introduced by traders, would establish itself as firmly as the Aegean mythology was established in Etruria—to judge by the frequency with which it was treated in Etruscan Art. Furthermore, religion and mythology are as inseparable in Etruria as in Greece, and no one supposes that early Greek traders acted as missionaries. Probably the original immigrants into Etruria brought with them the folklore of their ancestors. The often noted variations of the Etruscan from the Greek versions will then not be due to misunderstanding or to perversion on the part of the Etruscans; they probably preserved the old stories without much change, while the Greeks made works of art out of them—"expurgated" them, Mr. Gilbert Murray would say.

Examples of Etruscan mythological names are *Aita* ('Αἰδης), *Phersipnei* (Περσεφόνη), *Xanu(n)* (Χάρων), *Atunis* ('Αδωνις), *Arulu* (Ἀπόλλων), *Tinthun* (Τίθωνος), *Tute* (Τυδεύς), *Pecse* (Πήγασος), *Aθ-ρα* ('Ατροπος), *Ax(e)le* ('Αχιλλεύς), *Atlenta* ('Αταλάντη). Most of these names are without satisfactory etymology in Greek, and many of them recur in place names of Asia Minor and Greece; at least in large part they were borrowed by the Greeks along with the mythology. A few mythological names, however, among them some that appear in Etruscan, seem to be Greek in origin. Such are *Ἀλέξανδρος* (Etruscan *Alcsentre*, *Elaxsantre*), *Μενέλαος* (Etruscan *Menle*), and *Ἡρακλῆς* (Etruscan *Herle*). Either these names were borrowed by the Greeks from the Aegean languages and then modified on the analogy of native speech material, or they were borrowed from the Greek newcomers in Aegean lands by the ancestors of the Etruscans. In either case these names, no less than the others, point to an Eastern origin for the Etruscans¹².

¹²Some of the mythological names in the Italic languages were probably taken directly from Etruscan. Latin *Herle* is obviously

While the correspondences in proper names are extremely important on account of their great number, etymologies of ordinary words are likely to be more convincing, since their meaning serves as an additional check. Although we still know little of Etruscan and of the Aegean languages, several etymologies have been pointed out.

Possibly the best of these concerns the word which lies at the base of the names *Τυρσ-ηνοί*, *Tusci* (from **Turs-co-*), Umbrian *Turs-kum*, Egyptian *Turs*, *E-trus-ci*, *E-trur-ia*¹³. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae* 1. 26, records the opinion that the Tyrrheni were so named because they built towers on the walls of their towns, and he adds: 'For among them, as well as among the Greeks, roofed buildings upon city walls are called *τύρσεις*'. From an Aegean language, then, the Greeks borrowed their word *τύρσις*, *τύρρις*, and from the Etruscan cognate the Romans took their *turris*. The fact that the Etruscans of historical times called themselves *Rasena* does not militate against this etymology. The Greeks called themselves 'Ἕλληνες, but *Ἀκαίῳας*, *Ῥαῖνα*, and *Graeci*, their names in Egyptian, Old Persian, and Latin, are all Greek words.

That the verb *δπιώω*, 'marry', is not of Greek origin is indicated by the Hesychian loss, *δπιώδαι: γεγαμηκότες*, which contains a non-Greek suffix. We have noted above that suffixes in *l* are characteristic of Etruscan and Lemnian and also of the proper names of Asia Minor. The stem of both words is no doubt to be seen in Etruscan *puia*, 'wife'. The initial vowel of *δπιώω* may be of Aegean origin, or it may be the *o*-copulative of *δπατρός*, etc.

One of the few bilingual Etruscan inscriptions is as follows (*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 11. 6,363): *Haruspex fulguriator*—netsvis trutnot frontac. Since the last word is known to mean 'fulguriator', the first Etruscan word probably contains a part of the meaning of *haruspex*; quite possibly it means 'entrails'. If so, we seem to find its stem in Greek *νηδύς*, 'belly', and *νηδυνία*, 'entrails'.

Etruscan *falas* and *falsti* refer to boundary pillars. The stem reappears in Hesychius: *φάλαι: δροι, σκοπιαί* (as emended by M. Hammerström).

Etruscan *epithi*, *epithne*, *puithne* is the title of an official. It seems to be the same word as *πρότανις*. To the same sphere belongs *τύραννος*, which may be connected with Etruscan *Turan*, 'Venus', who in that case was called 'mistress'. The latter etymology derives a certain plausibility from a number of personal names from Asia Minor, such as *Τυραν(ν)ις*, *Τυραννος*, *Touραννος*, and Latin *Turanus*.

Stephanus of Byzantium says that *Τετράπολις* in Attica was formerly called *Ῥττηρία*. Since Etruscan *huθ* means 'four', it is clear that the later name was a translation of the earlier.

It would probably not be difficult to add to this list, identical with Etruscan *Herle*, and Oscan *Herkleis* and Latin *Hercules* may be modifications of the same form. Does *Meherle* contain Etruscan *mi*, 'this'? (compare *ille Diespieler*, Livy 1. 24. 8). It is likely also that some of the myths recorded by Roman writers came from Etruscan sources: an example may be the tale of Hercules's exploits on the site of Rome (Vergil, *Aen.* 8. 185-302; Livy 1. 7).

¹³Prothesis and metathesis of vowel and liquid are characteristic both of the Aegean languages and of Etruscan.

and on another occasion I hope to do so. Enough material has already been presented to show rather clearly that Etruscan belongs to the same group of languages as those spoken in Greece and the Aegean islands before the coming of the Hellenes and, in some localities, well into the historical period.

Although there is much to indicate that the Etruscan language was brought to Italy by a migration from the Aegean region, we do not know from what particular part of that region the colonists came. Quite possibly the Minoans in Crete spoke an Aegean language; but Professor G. W. Botsford, *Hellenic History*, 59, 187, certainly went beyond the evidence in calling the Etruscans Minoan colonists. We should rather think of many voyages from different Tyrrhenian or Pelasgian ports, and extending over a considerable period of time. If any care to search for a more precise source, Thessaly, Lemnos, and Attica have at least as good a claim as Crete.

There is little reason for deriving the Etruscan language or people from Lydia. The myth recorded by Herodotus seems not to have reflected the prevailing ancient tradition, and it is opposed by the weight of our other evidence, particularly the evidence of language.

Lydian, like Etruscan and the prehistoric speech of the Aegean lands, belongs to a linguistic stock, which may conveniently be called the Mediterranean languages (without, however, implying any necessary connection with the Mediterranean race which is found on all the shores of the Mediterranean Sea). The known Mediterranean languages belong to two branches, one of which consists of Etruscan and the Aegean languages, and the other of Lydian, Mysian, Lycian, Carian, and other languages of Asia Minor. Lydian and Etruscan are therefore related to each other somewhat as Italian and English are related, although both have nearer kindred elsewhere.

It remains to determine what connection, if any, the Mediterranean languages have with the Hittite (or pseudo-Hittite) inscriptions, the Caucasian languages, or Indo-European. Any such connection that may hereafter be made probable will almost certainly be more remote than the relationship between Etruscan and the languages of the Aegean.

The best introduction to the study of Etruscan history and of the Etruscan language is the article *Etruskisch*, by A. Körte and F. Skutsch, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 6, 730-806 (1908). There is an interesting, but less extensive and less reliable account, by Richard Norton and R. S. Conway, in *Encyclopedia Britannica*¹¹ 9, 854-862, under the heading *Etruria*.

The Etruscan documents are being published in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum*, which is to include not only the Etruscan inscriptions, but also Latin inscriptions written by Etruscans, other inscriptions from Etruria, the Lemnian epitaph, and the linen book-roll. Volume 1 (1893-1902) contains the inscriptions from Northern Etruria. Volume 2, Section 1, Part 1 (1907) contains the inscriptions from Volsinii, and Volume 2, Section 2, Part 1 (1912) covers the district about

Falerii and Capena, and includes the inscriptions in the Faliscan dialect, which is closely related to Latin. A large part of the Etruscan inscriptions must still be studied in the periodicals in which they were originally published, or in R. Fabretti, *Corpus Inscriptionum Italicarum* (Turin, 1867), which contains many incorrect or doubtful readings. The longest inscription known was published by F. Buecheler, in *Rheinisches Museum* 64.1-8 (1900). Important notes on it may be found in A. Torp, *Bemerkungen zur Etruskischen Inschrift von S. Maria di Capua*, Christiania (1905).

The linen book-roll was published by J. Krall, in an article entitled *Die Etruskische Mumienbinden des Agramer Nationalmuseums*, Vienna (1892), in *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse*, 41.1-70. The manuscript was collated by G. Herbig, in preparation for publication in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum*, and, although such publication has not yet been possible, Herbig's corrections and notes have appeared in the article, *Die Leinwandrolle des Agramer Museums*, Munich (1911), published in *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Philologische und Historische Klasse*, 25.

The work that has been done on the interpretation of the Etruscan documents is widely scattered in periodicals and monographs. Several recent articles have been mentioned above. Nearly everything of importance can be found by going through the annual reports published by F. Skutsch and F. Hartmann. Skutsch contributed reports covering the years 1890-1906 to Vollmer's *Kritische Jahresbericht für die Fortschritte der Romanischen Sprachwissenschaft*, Volumes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11. The years beginning with 1907 were covered in the same way by Skutsch's annual reports on *Italische Sprachen und Lateinische Grammatik* in the new periodical, *Glotta*, founded by Kretschmer and Skutsch in 1909. Since Skutsch's death these reports have been continued by Hartmann.

YALE UNIVERSITY EDGAR HOWARD STURTEVANT

READING POWER IN LATIN

When Dr. Flexner was trying to clear the way for the "Modern School", his invincible hatred of Latin led him not only to exclude it offhand from his own School, but also to attempt to discredit it for use anywhere.

To this end he presented some statistics—later shown to be garbled²—from the results of the College Entrance Board Examinations, which showed (he claimed) that the great majority of those who took the examinations failed to attain a grade of 60% or better in Latin.

He called attention, also, to the fact that the examinations normally were taken by a select group of students, some of whom were specially coached. Consequently he asked, "What would the record be if all

¹A Modern School, 6.

²The Sham Argument Against Latin, by C. H. Forbes. That Dr. Flexner may have since admitted some degree of error does not concern the aim of the present paper, which is merely to show at this point how certain false ideas came into circulation.

who studied these subjects <Latin, algebra, geometry> were thus examined by an impartial outside body?"

The inference, of course, is that Latin training is practically a complete failure; and he sums up as follows³:

... I have quoted figures to show how egregiously we fail to teach Latin. These figures mean that instead of getting orderly training by solving difficulties in Latin translation or composition, pupils guess, fumble, receive surreptitious assistance or accept on faith the injunctions of teacher and grammar. The only discipline that most students could get from their classical studies is a discipline in doing things as they should not be done.

Were it not for the official position held by Dr. Flexner, such evident animus against the subject of Latin would go far to render the attack itself nugatory. But it is quite a different matter when a manifesto is brought out under the auspices of the General Education Board, by one of its members, and broadcasted through a mailing list said to approximate sixty thousand.

It is not at all to be wondered at that the lesser lights in education—who must be up to date at any cost—should hasten to fall into line with a pronouncement of this sort. But it is deplorable that any teacher of Latin, for any object whatsoever, should indorse such false and unjust claims. One such goes even so far as to declare:

... But that the great majority (probably 99 per cent) of the half million pupils now studying Latin in our secondary schools will never learn to read Latin in any real sense of the term is an obvious fact, too patent to require demonstration.

At this point, the present writer is suffering from no illusions. For many reasons the teaching of Latin (and of some other subjects!) is not as successful as we might wish. But we should stand like a rock against unjust criticism at the hands of an enemy who would destroy Latin altogether, if he could.

Past and present methods of teaching Latin not only can, but often do, produce very satisfactory results in the matter of developing reading-power. Two or three years of High School Latin of course will not bring a student to the point where he can handle difficult passages from an author with whom he is not familiar. But pupils in great numbers do acquire a reasonable ability to read at sight in a text of the grade they have studied.

The writer recalls visiting a military School, where the Latin was in the hands of an enthusiastic and capable young man. After the regular work was done, the Caesar class turned over to a later book not previously read, and translated sentence after sentence in splendid form.

What was done in that School can be done in other Schools, if conditions are favorable, and the teacher is competent. If it be suggested that these boys, too, were a 'picked lot' (which did not seem to the writer to be the case), we certainly can turn with confidence to the uniform examination given last year to *all* the

Second-Year Latin students in *all* the recognized Secondary Schools in New York State.

Here Dr. Flexner's wonder as to what would happen if *all* students were subjected to examination is in a fair way to be set at rest. Of the 15,000 students subjected to the test, 11,000 passed with a grade of 60% or better; and, of all the different parts of the examination, translation of Caesar at sight stands out as one of those in which the highest scores were consistently made⁴.

There is room for improvement, of course. But teachers of Latin have no occasion to go about in an apologetic attitude. If you wear on your back a placard which reads 'Kick Me', you are very likely to be kicked.

In putting through this examination in the State of New York, the American Classical League has rendered a real service. The results are such as to give pause to the detractors of Latin as now taught in the Schools.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

H. C. NUTTING

REVIEWS

Child-Life, Adolescence and Marriage in Greek New Comedy and in the Comedies of Plautus. By David Russell Lee. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company (1919). Pp. x + 76.

The object of this study is, in the words of the author (ix), "confined to the drawing, in as complete a manner as possible, of the picture of family life as represented in the Greek New Comedy and in Plautus", a picture which he characterizes (vii) as "a comprehensive one though it is not a complete and perfectly balanced one". The book is divided into two parts, the first of which (1-32) deals with the Greek New Comedy, the second (33-62) with The Comedies of Plautus. There are a few pages of Introduction (vii-ix) and a full Bibliography (64-66) and Indices (67-71, 72-76). Each of the main sections contains nine chapters in which are treated (in the same order in each part) such topics as birth and infancy, exposure of children, teachers and education, adolescence and morals, marriage, etc. The Greek material is carefully separated from the Latin and the author explicitly refrains from discussing the most important problem suggested by such material: the problem of separating Greek from Roman elements in Plautus. "It is not a part of this study", he says (viii ix), "to indicate, except occasionally, what in Plautus is Roman and what is Greek". He has arranged his work, however, in such a way as to facilitate a comparative study by others, "if this is desired".

As a result of this restriction in aim and also of the method adopted by the author, the book is very little more than a brief English paraphrase of the Greek and the Latin material. There is no real discussion of the evidence and very few comparisons of the Greek and the Latin evidence on the same topics. The author's method is to allow the material to tell its own story by

³A Modern School. 18 ff.

⁴See the details in University of the State of New York Bulletin, No. 773, January 1, 1923.

paraphrasing or epitomizing each passage in English and by arranging these necessarily more or less scrappy statements as logically as possible. He very rarely cites even a word of the original Greek or Latin, so that it is necessary to turn for the real material to the books which contain the Greek and the Latin texts. This is not a serious difficulty so far as Plautus is concerned, for Plautus may be had in one volume—if one is willing to pay the price!—but for the New Comedy it is necessary to consult not only Körte's *Menandrea* and Capps's *Four Plays of Menander*, but also Kock's *Fragmenta* and Demianczuk's *Supplementum* thereto, and this means for most of us visiting a large library. If the references were accurate, much trouble might be spared the reader in looking them up, but, so far as I have been able to test them, they are neither accurate nor complete. It would have doubled the value of the book if Professor Lee had printed the Greek and the Latin passages, or, when they were too long, the significant parts of them.

If the material had to be presented in English dress, an accurate translation would have been a far easier and more satisfactory method than a paraphrase. It is very difficult to paraphrase and epitomize such a mass of material without misleading the reader, especially when (as in this book) an effort is made to weld the material together into some sort of connected English; it is all too easy to generalize on an insufficient basis, an error into which Professor Lee not infrequently falls, although he tries to be careful. Take, for instance, the section in Part I on The Exposure of Children (3-6). On page 38, in the section devoted to the corresponding topic in Plautus, Professor Lee states that Kock's fragments of the Greek New Comedy present exceedingly little on this subject. But on pages 3-4, and 38 he declares that the Cairo fragments contain "much material", as he puts it, on the topic. After all, he devotes just two pages (4-5) to presenting the content of the Greek. In this presentation he uses such expressions as "frequently", "it was very common", "the exposure of daughters was frequently practised", "usually", etc. Now, such expressions convey the impression that exposure was represented in the New Comedy as a common practice, and this impression is only strengthened by other statements accompanied by correct qualifying phrases such as "sometimes", "in one instance", and the like. It is only when one notices that the whole section is based on references to only seven Greek plays that one perceives that a distorted impression is being given, for each play represents only one case of exposure, however many references to that one case it may contain, and over half of the references are drawn from two plays, the *Perikeiromene* and the *Epileptontes*. Moreover, the number seven must be reduced to five, for we must subtract Menander's *Phasma* and *Heros*, the references to which show that exposure is not alluded to. Professor Lee uses *Phasma* II ff. to support his statement, "A nurse sometimes did the actual work of exposing the child" (4), but the Greek passage shows that the child was not 'exposed'; she was given to a nurse to rear, which is quite a different

thing. Similarly, the hypothesis of the *Heros* is the only ancient reference given for the following statements (4):

... Twins, a boy and a girl, are represented as exposed by a girl mother and are turned over, all unwittingly, many years later, to their own father by the man who found them when exposed. The exposure of daughters was frequently practised. Sons were seldom exposed.

But in reality the Greek states that the mother gave them to a steward to rear, that she later married their father, and that the one who was rearing them (not the "man who found them") gave them as a pledge (for a loan) to the father. There is nothing in the Greek about the frequent exposure of daughters, etc.; this seems to come from the English translation of Legrand's *Daos*, which is also referred to. On one point Legrand would have set Professor Lee right, for he says with regard to the *Heros*, "Myrrhiné, du *Ἡρώς*, a confié ses jumeaux <not exposed them> à un affranchi de sa famille", etc. (French edition, page 255).

But as to the frequency of the exposure of daughters which Legrand asserts not only for the New Comedy itself but for the Greek life back of it—is Professor Lee right in accepting this view? Legrand bases his view not only upon the New Comedy, but also upon the references to the practice in other writers, especially Plautus and Terence, whom he uses as a help in reconstructing the New Comedy—rightly, I think, in this case, although the validity of this method is to be seriously questioned when he applies it to many other topics. He argues against Mahaffy (*Greek Life and Thought*, etc., 120), who thought exposure rare outside the drama. But for the New Comedy (including Plautus and Terence) the total number of references is after all not very large when we consider the many hundreds of plays that were written and the very large number of fragments and testimonia that have come down to us. But, however we may differ as to what 'frequency' means so far as the plays are concerned, the misleading tendency of Professor Lee's method is evident. He limits himself to presenting family life as it appears in the plays and does not discuss how accurately this picture reflects real life, but on such an important topic as this it seems almost necessary to point out that the plays give but a distorted reflection of the life of the period. Exposure appears as often as it does in the New Comedy because it is a valuable dramatic motif. Professor Capps says (*Four Plays of Menander*, 52, Note), "The extent of the practice <i. e. in real life> is by no means to be inferred from the use made of the motive, with its romantic possibilities, by the dramatic poets" and recently, in a paper which appeared too late for Professor Lee to use, Professor Van Hook has shown how inadequate all the ancient evidence is to prove the frequency of the practice in Greece until after the period of the New Comedy (*Transactions of the American Philological Association* 51 [1920], 134-145). In *Classical Philology* 17 (1922), a Dutch scholar, H. Bolkestein, in an article, *The Exposure of Children at Athens*, etc., stated (222) that he had reached results virtually identical with those

set forth by Professor Van Hook. The practice was in fact rather exceptional, and we may rid ourselves of the idea that the street corners of Athens were cluttered up with infants crying to be rescued—no small relief to one who wishes to have a just conception of Greek life.

In the references to Plautus on this topic there are some errors. Professor Lee says (38), "Children exposed and reared even by courtesans were sometimes kept chastely". This is true, but there is nothing in Cist. 570 ff., to which reference is made, about chastity. Again, Cist. 164 does not show that "There is an apologetic attitude with reference to exposure", nor, I may add, does Sandys say anything about this in *The Companion to Latin Studies*, 176 (this reference also is given).

There is a very incomplete picture of Plautine cooks (44-45). We read that "The *Pseudolus* is the only Latin play in which the cook takes a part of any importance. He does not appear in Terence", but the only references given are to Legrand, (page 98, English translation), and to Miss Harcum's dissertation, *Roman Cooks* (19-21. For this dissertation see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 8.215). Now, it is true that cooks do not take parts of much importance, but certainly if we are considering this point, the cooks in the *Aulularia* take a more important part in the play than does he of the *Pseudolus*, for in the *Aulularia* one of the cooks is brought into relation with a chief motif of the play, the old miser's fear for his precious *aula*. However, the references are wrong in any event, for neither Legrand nor Miss Harcum alludes to the relative importance of the rôles of different cooks. For the bragging propensities of cooks reference is made to Aul. 280, Merc. 697, and Miss Harcum (39). But in Aul. 280 there is nothing about brag; in the *Mercator* the cook not only does not brag, but he does not even cook! Miss Harcum discusses the boastfulness of cooks, but does not cite these passages. Except these two references all Professor Lee's material is drawn from the *Pseudolus*. He could have got good material to complete his picture from the *Menaechmi*, and from further study of the *Aulularia* and the *Mercator*.

For a picture of the *paedagogus* Professor Lee naturally relies on the *Bacchides*. He refers once to Asin. 873 ff., but there is nothing about pedagogues in the entire scene. There are, however, references which throw some light on the question, in Merc. 90-93, and Pseud. 447, to which he does not refer.

A curious error appears on page 44. "Plautus represents grown persons as remembering plays seen in childhood", says Professor Lee, referring to Cas. 10 ff. But this passage was not written by Plautus; in fact verses 12-20 imply clearly that Plautus has been long dead! It is the famous passage which shows that the plays of Plautus were revived about a generation after his death. Moreover "childhood" is not mentioned, but only the fact that men now *iuniores* could not remember the play when it was first given, but the *seniores* could. Another similar mistake is the reference to Epid. 168 ff. to prove that "a daughter-in-

law is treated as an own daughter", for there is no daughter-in-law in the whole play.

The book may be useful as a convenient summary of material for those who are interested in any of the topics with which it deals, but it seems fairly clear that no one should accept the statements in the text without looking up the original passages on which they are supposed to be based.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

ARTHUR L. WHEELER

Our Hellenic Heritage. By H. R. James. Volume II, Part III. Athens—Her Splendour and Fall. London: Macmillan and Company (1922). Pp. XI + 288.

A review of the first volume of this work appeared in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.8. Volume I, which was made up of two parts, is now followed by this, which is Part III of the whole work, and is also the first installment of Volume II. Part IV, which will later appear, as the completion of Volume II, will deal with the art and the literature of Greece. Part III, which is now before us for review, presents the history of the years between 479 and 403 B. C. Political events occupy the foreground. The titles of the chapters show the author's aptness in phrasing; compare for example, these: The Path of Empire, The City Beautiful, The Lost Opportunity, The Gamble in Sicily, The Passing of the Splendour. Naturally, the history is not encumbered with detail. The larger outlines are distinctly given, with a feeling for the significant and the picturesque. The author is plainly familiar with Thucydides and has reproduced in his pages much of the Thucydidean emphasis. He has, besides, the larger view of the sources of history, and uses freely the evidence of inscriptions and works of art. Particularly good are the maps and the plans, twelve in number, and the eight illustrations, the last one of which, the fortress of Phyle, is not often reproduced. In style the book is eminently readable. Teachers of ancient history will find the volume valuable for collateral reading.

HAMILTON COLLEGE

EDWARD FITCH

Aristoteles' Metaphysik, Übersetzt und Erläutert von Dr. Theol. Eug. Rolfes; Zweite, Verbesserte Auflage (Volumes 2-3 of *Meiner's Philosophische Bibliothek*). Leipzig: Meiner (1920 and 1921).

Dr. Rolfes's revision of his painstaking and scholarly translation of 1904 preserves to a large extent, in so far as I have examined it, both the merits and the defects of the first edition. Like the first edition, it is based upon Bekker's text of 1831. To Rolfes's mind Bonitz and Christ have been overbold in emendation, and Alexander and Zeller are guides who must be used with great caution; the best guide is Thomas Aquinas, and the new Preface quotes with approval the words of Pico, *Sine Thoma mutus est Aristoteles*. This of course is not surprising in one who is a Catholic priest and a neo-Thomist. In the new Preface a rather indefinite acknowledgement is made to Lasson's translation; Ross's is not mentioned.

The attempt made in the first edition to translate by a method so invariable that one acquainted with the method might almost reconstitute the text from the translation has here been pressed even further. I have noted numerous passages in which synonyms have been substituted, in which the word-order has been brought nearer to that of the Greek, or in which words not directly represented in the Greek have been omitted, but almost no passages in which the changes had any serious effect upon the interpretation. Most of the notes stand unchanged (the explanatory notes are still, somewhat inconveniently, placed at the end); and, although a few new explanatory notes have been added, the treatment of Aristotle's predecessors is still scant.

There are several changes in form: the two volumes

are paged continuously, which is an improvement; the marginal numbering of the lines of Rolfes's own pages has been abandoned, which is also an improvement (unfortunately the lines of the large Berlin edition are still not indicated); and the references to the pages and the columns of the large Berlin edition have been transferred from the outer to the inner margins. In general the format is less attractive than that of the first edition. And the proof-reading is less accurate.

In spite of these minor defects, however, students of Aristotle will be grateful to the translator for making even more useful what was already a notably useful help to the study of a most difficult book.

AMHERST COLLEGE

FRANCIS H. FOBES